REMARKS

Claims 1-64 were pending. Claims 10, 27, 43 and 62 have been cancelled. Claims 69-72 have been added. Claims 1, 19, 34, 42, 50 and 61 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-26, 28-42, 44-61, and 63-72 remain pending in the application subsequent entry of the present amendment.

The amendments to claims 1, 19, 34, 42, 50 and 61 are supported by at least claims 10, 27, 43, and 62, as well as FIG. 5 and the related description.

In the present Office Action, claims 1-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 (hereinafter "Shoff"). Applicant has reviewed the cited art and rejections and submits the claims clearly recite features not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method which includes:

> "wherein said interactive application is configured to provide two or more levels of added content, and wherein said automated input is indicative of a particular level of said levels of added content to be displayed."

In the present Office Action, claim 10 is rejected in view of Schoff, col. 5, lines 12-52. However, Applicant has carefully reviewed the cited portion of Schoff and submits the claims are patentably distinct. On page 5, para. 4, of the Office Action, the examiner states:

> "Schoff further discloses where at least one of the one or more automatic selections indicates a particular level of added content to be provided . . . note that the user upon interacting to the icon receives different levels of the advertisements."

Schoff does not disclose the features as suggested by the examiner. First, nothing in the cited disclosure of Schoff discloses "the automatic selections indicates a particular level of added content to be provided." The cited disclosure of Schoff simply discusses hypertext documents. There is nothing concerning an automatic selection indicating a particular level of content to be provided. The concept of levels of added content is wholly absent from the cited art. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited art. Each of claims 19, 34, and 50 are distinguishable for similar reasons.

Further, Applicant notes the examiner has simply cut and paste the rejections regarding the recited features concerning a queue in claims – even though the Applicant pointedly traversed these rejections. As already noted by the Applicant – the examiner suggests that the features of claims 9, 17, 18, 26, 32, 42, 48, and 61 are disclosed by Schoff. However, Schoff contains no disclosure of a queue or of storing the selections in a message queue, or any such disclosure. If the examiner wishes to maintain these rejections, Applicant requests the examiner respond to the Applicants traversal and point out such disclosure with particularity.

In addition to the above, the features of new claims 69-72 are nowhere disclosed by the cited art.

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner believe issues remain, the below signed representative would greatly appreciate, and requests, a telephone interview at (512) 853-8866 to facilitate a speedy resolution.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-03400/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rory D. Rankin /
Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: March 26, 2007